UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,366	06/19/2006	Arnaud Bailleul	4590-538	8191

33308   7590   10/22/2009
LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP
1700 DIAGONAL ROAD, SUITE 300
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 October 2009*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *10-18* is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *10-18* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This non-final office action is in response to the RCE filed 1 October 2009, and

the amendment filed 23 September 2009.

2.   Claims 10-18 are pending. Claim 10 is an independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 10-12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Alhir (Learning UML, published July 2003), and further in view of "I-Logix

Introduces Wizard-Based Documentation Product for Web Publishing to Facilitate Team

Collaboration," 8 May 2000, hereafter I-Logix).

As per independent claim 10, Alhir discloses a method for production of a

documentary chain on the basis of a structured model, comprising the following steps:

loading of a structured model into a modeling tool (Section 3.1: Here, a class

model is loaded)

generating of documentary fragments of the model (Section 3.1.1: Here,

attributes are generated to be added to the class)

selecting of the model including the documentary information and of the

generator of documentary fragments (Section 3.1.1: Here, the class model is selected to

be loaded prior to the generation of the class fragments to be added)

inserting of the documentary fragments generated into the documentary structure

of the documentary chain (Figures 3.1 and 3.2: Here, the generated documentary

fragments are added to the loaded class model)

Alhir fails to specifically disclose opening a document with a text processor.

However, I-Logix discloses opening a document with a text processor (page 1: Here, a

user is presented with an interface prompt into which he/she enters text information for

building a report in Microsoft® Word®).

Alhir fails to specifically disclose selecting a fragment from a tree whose tree

structure echoes the architecture of the packages of the starting model and inserting the

fragment at its location in the document. However, I-Logix discloses selecting a

fragment from a tree whose tree structure echoes the architecture of the packages of

the starting model and inserting the fragment at its location in the document (page 1:

Here, a user selects a customizable template, or starting model. The user is queried,

via a Wizard, to enter information, such as diagrams, codes, and descriptions. Upon

completion of this data entry, a report is generated by inserting the gathered data into

the starting model).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined I-Logix with Alhir, since it would have allowed a

user to be guided, via a Wizard, through creation of a modeling report.

As per dependent claim 11, Alhir discloses wherein the structured model is a

UML model (Section 3.1.1).

As per dependent claim 12, Alhir discloses wherein the updated of the

documentation is performed with the aid of dynamic links established for each fragment

generated between its location in the documentary chain and its physical file arising

from the automatic documentary generation (Section 3.2: Here, a link is added to the

model in order specify relations between the physical files represented by the UML

model).

As per dependent claim 17, Alhir discloses wherein the final documentation

comprises manual free text included between the fragments generated (Section 3.2:

Here, the models include text defining the links between model fragments. For

example, Figure 3.13 discloses that a user is "ResponsibleFor" "theWorkProduct"

"WorkProduct." This free text helps to define the association between "Worker" and

"WorkProduct").

6.   Claims 13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Alhir and I-Logix and further in view of "Bringing It All Together" (July 2002,

hereafter BIAT).

As per dependent claim 13, Alhir and I-Logix disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Alhir fails to

specifically disclose wherein the model is produced with the aid of the "RHAPSODY"

tool and that "RHAPSODY-DOC" is used to generate the documentary fragments that

one desires to include in the final documentation. However, BIAT discloses the use of

Rhapsody to generate the documentary fragments that one desires to include in the

final documentation (pages 1-2: Here, Rhapsody is used to provide support for

automatic code generation from a UML model). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined BIAT

with Alhir, since it would have allowed a user to automatically generate software code

from a UML model.

As per dependent claim 14, Alhir, I-Logix, and BAIT disclose the limitations

similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. BAIT

discloses wherein the documentary fragments are inserted into a document opened in a

text processing (pages 1-2: Here, text of the UML document is processed to be included

in the automatically generated code). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined BAIT with Alhir,

since it would have allowed for the automatic inclusion of UML text data within the

generated code.

As per dependent claim 15, Alhir and I-Logix disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Alhir fails to specifically discloses wherein the "RHAPSODY-DOC" tool is used with "DOORS" for the generation of the documentary fragments processing information around the requirements, then the combination of "RHAPSODY-DOC" with a text processing so as to insert these DOORS fragments and architecture its final document. However, BAIT discloses wherein the "RHAPSODY-DOC" tool is used with "DOORS" for the generation of the documentary fragments processing information around the requirements, then the combination of "RHAPSODY-DOC" with a text processing so as to insert these DOORS fragments and architecture its final document (pages 1-2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined BAIT with Alhir, since it would have allowed a user to interface between the UML model and other model languages, such as XMI.

As per dependent claim 16, Alhir and I-Logix disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Alhir fails to specifically disclose wherein the "RHAPSODY-DOC" tool is used with "DOORS" and a text processing for the document generation. However, BAIT discloses wherein the "RHAPSODY-DOC" tool is used with "DOORS" and a text processing for the document generation (pages 1-2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined BAIT with Alhir, since it would have allowed a user to interface between the UML model and other model languages, such as XMI.

7.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alhir and

I-Logix, and further in view of Pastor et al. (US 6681383, filed 4 April 2000, hereafter

Pastor).

As per dependent claim 18, Alhir and I-Logix disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Alhir fails to

specifically disclose filtering of data. However, Pastor discloses filtering of data (column

9, lines 28-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the applicant's invention to have combined Pastor with Alhir, since it would have

allowed for a user to specify preconditions to be satisfied prior to performing actions.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-18 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-

4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle R Stork/
Examiner, Art Unit 2178